

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA



**ASSOCIATION of  
GOVERNMENTS**

**Main Office**

818 West Seventh Street  
12th Floor  
Los Angeles, California  
90017-3435

t (213) 236-1800  
f (213) 236-1825

[www.scag.ca.gov](http://www.scag.ca.gov)

**Officers:** President: Gary Ovitt, San Bernardino County  
First Vice President: Richard Dixon, Lake Forest  
Second Vice President: Harry Baldwin, San Gabriel  
Immediate Past President: Yvonne B. Burke, Los Angeles County

**Imperial County:** Victor Carrillo, Imperial County • Jon Edney, El Centro

**Los Angeles County:** Yvonne B. Burke, Los Angeles County • Zev Yaroslavsky, Los Angeles County • Richard Alarcon, Los Angeles • Jim Aldinger, Manhattan Beach • Harry Baldwin, San Gabriel • Tony Cardenas, Los Angeles • Stan Carroll, La Habra Heights • Margaret Clark, Rosemead • Gene Daniels, Paramount • Judy Dunlap, Inglewood • Rae Gabelich, Long Beach • David Gafin, Downey • Eric Garcetti, Los Angeles • Wendy Greuel, Los Angeles • Frank Gurrel, Cudahy • Janice Hahn, Los Angeles • Isadore Hall, Compton • Keith W. Hanks, Azusa • José Huizar, Los Angeles • Jim Jeffra, Lancaster • Tom LaBonge, Los Angeles • Paula Lantz, Pomona • Barbara Messina, Alhambra • Larry Nelson, Artesia • Paul Nowatka, Torrance • Pam O'Connor, Santa Monica • Bernard Parks, Los Angeles • Jan Perry, Los Angeles • Ed Reyes, Los Angeles • Bill Rosendahl, Los Angeles • Greig Smith, Los Angeles • Tom Sykes, Walnut • Mike Ten, South Pasadena • Tonia Reyes Uranga, Long Beach • Antonio Villaraigosa, Los Angeles • Dennis Washburn, Calabasas • Jack Weiss, Los Angeles • Herb J. Wesson, Jr., Los Angeles • Dennis Zine, Los Angeles

**Orange County:** Chris Norby, Orange County • Christine Barnes, La Palma • John Beauman, Brea • Lou Bone, Tustin • Debbie Cook, Huntington Beach • Leslie Daigle, Newport Beach • Richard Dixon, Lake Forest • Troy Edgar, Los Alamitos • Paul Glaab, Laguna Niguel • Robert Hernandez, Anaheim • Sharon Quirk, Fullerton

**Riverside County:** Jeff Stone, Riverside County • Thomas Buckley, Lake Elsinore • Bonnie Flickinger, Moreno Valley • Ron Loveridge, Riverside • Greg Pettis, Cathedral City • Ron Roberts, Temecula

**San Bernardino County:** Gary Ovitt, San Bernardino County • Lawrence Dale, Barstow • Paul Eaton, Montclair • Lee Ann Garcia, Grand Terrace • Tim Jasper, Town of Apple Valley • Larry McCallon, Highland • Deborah Robertson, Rialto • Alan Wapner, Ontario

**Ventura County:** Linda Parks, Ventura County • Glen Becerra, Simi Valley • Carl Morehouse, San Buenaventura • Toni Young, Port Hueneme

**Tribal Government Representative:** Andrew Masiel, Sr., Pechanga Band of Luiseño Indians

**Orange County Transportation Authority:** Art Brown, Buena Park

**Riverside County Transportation Commission:** Robin Lowe, Hemet

**San Bernardino Associated Governments:** Paul Leon

**Ventura County Transportation Commission:** Keith Millhouse, Moorpark

10/24/07

## MEETING OF THE

# PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Tuesday, January 8, 2008**

**1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.**

## SCAG Offices

**818 West 7<sup>th</sup> Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Bernardino Conference Room  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
213.236.1800**

## Video Conference Location

**SCAG Inland Empire Office  
3600 Lime Street, Suite 216  
Riverside, CA 92501  
(951) 784-1513**

If members of the public wish to review the attachments or have any questions on any of the agenda items, please contact Ryan Kuo at 213.236.1813 or [kuo@scag.ca.gov](mailto:kuo@scag.ca.gov)

Agendas and Minutes for the P&P TAC are also available at:

<http://www.scag.ca.gov/rtptac/index.htm>

SCAG, in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), will accommodate persons who require a modification of accommodation in order to participate in this meeting. If you require such assistance, please contact SCAG at (213) 236-1868 at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting to enable SCAG to make reasonable arrangements. To request documents related to this document in an alternative format, please contact (213) 236-1868.

# PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## AGENDA

	PAGE#	TIME
<i>"Any item listed on the agenda (action or information) may be acted upon at the discretion of the Committee".</i>		
1.0 <u>CALL TO ORDER &amp; INTRODUCTIONS</u>	Ty Schuiling, Chair	
2.0 <u>PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD</u> Members of the public desiring to speak on an agenda item or items not on the agenda, but within the purview of the Committee, must fill out and present a speaker's card to the assistant prior to speaking. A speaker's card must be turned in before the meeting is called to order. Comments will be limited to three minutes. The chair may limit the total time for all comments to twenty (20) minutes.		
3.0 <u>CONSENT CALENDAR</u>		
3.1 <u>Approval Items</u>		
3.1.1 <u>Approve Revised Minutes of August 27, 2007</u> <b>Attached</b>		
3.1.2 <u>Approve Minutes of October 15, 2007</u> <b>Attached</b>		
4.0 <u>DISCUSSION ITEMS</u>		
4.1 <u>Standing Items</u>		
4.1.1 <u>Draft 2008 RTP Growth Forecast</u> <i>Discussion of the growth forecast used in the Draft 2008 RTP.</i>	<b>Frank Wen, SCAG Staff</b>	<b>40 min.</b>
4.1.2 <u>Highways and Arterials</u> <i>No report</i>		
4.1.3 <u>Non-motorized / TDM</u> <i>No report</i>		

# PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

## AGENDA

---

4.2 <u>Conformity Update</u> <i>Discussion of the transportation conformity analysis for the Draft 2008 RTP.</i>	Jonathan Nadler, SCAG Staff	20 min.
---	--------------------------------	---------

4.3 <u>Draft 2008 Regional Transportation Plan</u> <i>Update on the status of the Draft 2008 RTP.</i>	Naresh Amatya, SCAG Staff	15 min.
--	------------------------------	---------

### 5.0 INFORMATION ITEMS

5.1 <u>Transit Summit</u> <i>Information on the upcoming Transit Summit.</i>	Andre Darmanin, SCAG Staff	10 min.
---	-------------------------------	---------

### 6.0 STAFF REPORT

No report.

### 7.0 ADJOURNMENT

The next meeting date of the Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee will be held at the SCAG offices on Thursday, February 21, 2008.

---

Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
of the  
Southern California Association of Governments

August 27, 2007

---

**Revised Minutes**

---

**THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY THE PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING. THE AUDIO CASSETTE TAPE OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN SCAG'S OFFICE.**

The P&P TAC held its meeting at the SCAG Headquarters in Los Angeles. The meeting was called to order by Ty Schuiling, Chair, SANBAG.

**Members Present:**

Ty Schuiling, Chair	SANBAG
Miles Mitchell, Vice-Chair	LADOT
Lori Abrishami	LACMTA
Gerald Bare	Caltrans-District 7
Joanna Capelle	SCRRA
Deborah Diep	CDR / CSU Fullerton
Kim Fuentes	South Bay Cities COG
Dana Gabbard	So. Ca. Transit Advocates
Bill Gayk (JiHong McDermott for)	Riverside County Transportation & Land Mgmt. Agency
Jack Humphrey	Gateway Cities COG
Paula McHargue	LAWA
Mike Labudzki	City of Burbank
Michael Litschi	OCTA
Greg Nord	OCTA
Tracy Sato	City of Anaheim
Gail Shiimoto-Loehr	Orange County COG
Tony Van Haagen	Caltrans-District 7
Dianna Watson	Caltrans-District 7
Carla Walecka	Transportation Corridor Agencies

**Videoconference:**

Catherine McMillan	CVAG
Arnold San Miguel	SCAG
Kevin Viera	WRCOG

**Teleconference:**

Rich Kuzmyak	Consultant
Rosa Lopez	IVAG

**SCAG Staff:**

Greg Bolen, Consultant	Darin Chidsey	Rich Macias
Tarek Hatata, Consultant	André Darmanin	Jessica Meaney
Joseph Alcock	Bob Huddy	Bev Perry
Naresh Amatya	Keith Killough	Alan Thompson
Mike Armstrong	Ryan Kuo	Frank Wen

## **1.0 CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Ty Schuiling, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:15 am. Introductions were made.

## **2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

There was no public comment.

## **3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR**

### **3.1 Approval Items**

#### **3.1.1 Approve Minutes of May 17, 2007**

Members reviewed minutes and recommended the following changes:

- Page 3, paragraph 2 to read as follows: "The jobs and households would be according to the 2035 ~~SCB~~ SED forecast and would be ...".
- Comments were received from Mike Labudzki, City of Burbank. Tarek Hatata, Systems Metrics will address comments during his presentation.

Deleted: Bill

*Motion was moved and unanimously approved with above-mentioned corrections.*

## **4.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **4.1 Aviation/Ground Access Report**

Mike Armstrong, SCAG, updated committee members on the project list changes in the Airport Ground Access Report. These changes were made as a result of recent information collected through field service, ground counts, and passenger surveys. Mr. Armstrong began by stating that the forecast for the 2008 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) is similar to the 2004 RTP with few changes in forecasts for the different airports. Mr. Armstrong presented major project changes for the 2008 project list, including changes that respond to input received from local airports and local cities. He added that a concerted and deliberate attempt was made to seek input from airports and cities that are within the local airport service area.

Mr. Armstrong also provided a brief summary on how the Ground Access Analysis was conducted. Mr. Armstrong mentioned that the Ground Access Analysis is closely tied to operations that are generated by the demand forecast and include air carrier, commuter, air cargo, military, and general aviation operations. The operational forecast is used to generate passenger trips and cargo truck trips and is based on a common methodology using the Regional Airport Demand Model (RADM) methodology. The analysis is also based on a very detailed schedule of operations to determine air passenger arrivals, delays, effects on ground access, passenger arrivals, and effects on ground access systems.

Mr. Armstrong reported the following key changes in the project list:

- Due to a downscale in March Inland Port projections from 8 to 2.5, projects were dropped to the non-essential list.
- In Ontario, a few projects were completed and dropped to the non-essential list. Additional projects requested by the City include grade separations and interchange improvements.
- ~~In Palmdale, a grade separation will be added at Rancho Vista Blvd. and Sierra Highway.~~
- The City of Burbank includes major improvements to Hollywood Blvd. Major upgrades to the Empire interchange with a new HOV facility. A transit center and expansion of the Burbank bus transit center will also be added.
- New 4-lane bridge to alleviate congestion at San Bernardino Airport and improvements to Mountain View from Palm Meadows to I-10.
- There are a number of project modifications for LAX. This includes modifications to the improvements to Manchester, Century Blvd., and Aviation, including not widening Sepulveda (South) through the Sepulveda Tunnel and preserving space on Century for potential light rail and transit, and no left turns on Aviation. New projects include a grade separation at Douglas for the Green Line and additional left turn lanes on La Cienega at Centinela.

**Deleted:** A

**Deleted:** Railroad tracks were added to the list in the City of Palmdale.

Mr. Armstrong stated that an aviation scenario has not been selected. These scenarios would change depending on the adoption of the High Speed Regional Transit (HSRT) System. Ty Schuiling, SANBAG, asked when a policy decision would be made regarding the selection of the High Speed Regional Transit System. Naresh Amatya, SCAG, addressed the question and stated that several workshops are being planned, one of which will focus on Aviation and the HSRT system. Mr. Amatya stated that this issue will also be discussed at the Maglev Task Force meeting, and recommendation will then be ~~brought forward~~ to the Transportation and Communications Committee (TCC), then to the Regional Council (RC) where a decision is made. Mr. Schuiling asked if the Cambridge Systematic work on the modal alternatives analysis is timely enough to support the decision for the 2008 RTP. Miles Mitchell, LADOT, stated that the study is currently delayed due to model-related issues. Results remain to be expected by the end of the year and if a formal report is not available, there may be an interim product that is issued that can be used for the 2008 RTP.

**Deleted:** escalated

Mr. Armstrong stated that John Wayne and Palm Springs Airports were not included in the presentation since there have not been any major changes.

#### 4.2 2003 Base Year & 2035 Baseline Modeling Result Comparison

Tarek Hatata, System Metrics Group, addressed the questions presented by the City of Burbank. Mr. Hatata stated that in the previous month's meeting a question was raised regarding automobile accessibility as a percent of home-based work trips that are completed within 45 minutes during the PM peak periods. The percentage stays the same between 2003 Base Year and 2035 Baseline. Mr. Labudzki, City of Burbank, questioned delay and stated that in multiple presentations it was shown that delay was increasing significantly and yet accessibility stayed the same. Mr. Hatata stated that between the months of May to August, the model has changed significantly. Therefore the difference is the result of the model evolution which has changed recently since the last TAC meeting.

Mr. Labudzki added that he understood that the results were preliminary; however, the results are showing measures that reflect a phenomenon, and may not be fully explaining what assumptions are based on behind the phenomenon. Mr. Labudzki further stated that regarding the congestion in the region, the home-to-work trips, which are not voluntary, and which are the trips that are hard to remove from the system or reduce somehow, do not seem to be affected. If this is true, then there are some assumptions behind it. Mr. Labudzki referred to the Community, Economic and Human Development Committee (CEHD) memo dated August 30<sup>th</sup>, Page 70, which reads, "As congestion increases, people who live closer to work will expect shopping and services to start locating closer to their homes". He further stated that if this travel behavior does not change, then at least those two assumptions are behind it. Mr. Hatata stated that the memo from CEHD discusses a growth scenario that he is not showing since the reference item is for transit-oriented development in which people live close to work and have transit facilities to link them. What was shown in the previous meeting had not incorporated these land use changes.

Keith Killough, SCAG, described the measures and stated that the answer is in the way that the measure is constructed. The measure states that one percent of trips can reach their destination within 45 minutes. Given all the trips that will be made, what percentage of those can reach their destination? In this particular measure, of the transit trips that are made, how many can get there in 45 minutes? Regardless of how the region grows and where the destinations are located, if transit trips that are made can get where they are going in that time period then the measure will remain the same. Mr. Labudzki stated that it would be helpful to make the same estimate for how the home-to-work trips will be affected in highly urbanized areas.

Mr. Hatata continued with his presentation and stated that moving forward, "PPP Plan" will reflect the approved base growth forecast with additional planned projects from long range plans and county inputs including private participation projects. Additionally, the "2035 CTC Plan" is similar to the 2035 Plan but does not include private participation projects.

Mr. Hatata also noted the following changes in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT). In the previous baseline, VMT was 555 and now increases to 573, which includes the private and public investments. For the CTC Plan, VMT drops to 566 and does not include the growth scenario and the TDM.

Mr. Hatata presented data regarding the AM Peak Period HBW Travel Time. On a SCAG-wide average, trip time increased from 28 minutes in 2003 to 31 minutes in the 2035 CTC. Mr. Hatata stated that the detail for the PPP Plan was not available; therefore it is not reflected in the chart. He went on to state that Los Angeles and Riverside account for this increase whereas in San Bernardino the average trip time decreases.

Due to congestion trip speeds Mr. Hatata stated that speeds decrease from 30 to 29 mph. This reduction is reflected in all counties. Personal hours of delay include the CTC Plan. In the CTC Plan, the personal minutes of delay per capita increases from 19 to 24.7. In the PPP Plan, this figure is in the 23 minute range.

Lori Abrishami, LACMTA, asked if the PPP Plan included constrained or total projects. Mr. Hatata stated that the PPP Plan included the Maglev system and does not include any new projects. The PPP Plan includes total projects and CTC is only constrained projects.

Mr. Hatata also discussed accessibility for transit home-based work (HBW) trips for the PM Peak period, which was slightly higher than 40% in 2003; approximately 43% of the transit trips in the PM Peak period can be completed. With the Baseline this improves to 48% and with the PPP Plan this improves to 48%. Accessibility for transit increases and accessibility for autos remains the same.

#### 4.3 Standing Item

##### 4.3.1 Growth Forecast

Glen Bolen, Fregonese & Associates, discussed the next steps for the Growth Visioning alternatives in the 2008 RTP. Mr. Bolen stated that staff has interviewed several cities and is looking in detail through their general plans and TAZ forecast. There are areas where our general plans need to be updated because they are not matching some of the ideas and advisory guidance from the Compass. Mr. Bolen stated that the modeling proved that a need exists for us to look at regional coordination and the way the Compass program worked to provide some of the backbone and the framework for coming up with a way that our transportation decisions work together in harmony to help us work towards a specific direction.

Mr. Bolen discussed the policy options that will be presented at the CEHD meeting. He stated that the workshop scenario is based on jurisdictional input and has been modified into the Envision Scenario that was discussed at the last TAC meeting. Staff is now going to work with the CEHD and review the policy options and use their direction to develop another draft alternative for testing.



Mr. Bolen stated that there are seven policy options to review. The first option is to identify special regional strategic areas for infill and investment. This includes small mixed use areas that may be more nodal along a corridor. Any time that a daily errand trip can be made closer to home the greater the chance for localized short trips and intra-zonal capture. The second option is to structure the plan on a 3-tier system. This option is based on the following criteria: existing areas, planned areas, and potential areas for future development. Mr. Bolen stated that the third option is to develop “complete communities” in which most daily needs can be met within a short distance of home. This increased general density will decrease dependence on the interregional system and result in greater local trip capture and shorter travel distances.

**Deleted:** that meet these criteria

**Deleted:** to identifying

**Deleted:** .

**Deleted:** since the more capacity that is created in retail areas, the less often we have to rely on the interregional system and have local trip capture and shorter distances to travel.

Mr. Bolen stated that a lesson learned from the demonstration projects is that the cities view this more nodal or more focused areas of activity with gaps in between. The fifth option is to plan for a changing demand in types of housing; explore additional growth potential. The sixth option is to continue to protect stable existing single family areas and plan for less dense development in outlying areas. The final option is to plan for additional housing and jobs within reach of transit network.

Mike Labudzki, City of Burbank, stated that the model development was based on walking access and future transit availability, for example, the success with Rapid Transit and that type of development. He stated that the nodal approach may be going behind it and that access to transit may be a key to transit development and providing more services on a frequent basis outside of the peak period so transit users can walk in to the station without having a schedule and use the transit and have convenient connections. This implies a high investment in transit and providing the transit opportunities. Corridors imply that there will be access to transit along these corridors. He asked if it will be realistic to provide good transit service frequently along major corridors. Mr. Bolen responded that there is a large amount of existing transit corridor style development, i.e. Hawthorne Blvd. Mr. Bolen explained that in sessions with other cities they were expecting a lot to happen in those stations areas. Cities were designating developments as a nucleus of activity and did not want to spread it out down the corridor.

Gail Shiimoto-Lohr, Orange County COG, referred to the CEHD staff report, pages 69 and 70, which talks about strong market forces that are being identified and the following: “Over the next 30 years accessibility will start to become more important than mobility. People will place value on the time it takes to get to work, errands and recreation rather than the speed at which they travel. As congestion increases, people will live closer to work and will expect shopping and services to start locating closer to homes.” Ms. Shiimoto-Lohr stated that this is a very bold statement and asked how the linkage came about. Ms. Shiimoto-Lohr also stated that

there are several other issues and choices that will potentially not change the current behavior i.e. where your kids go to school. Mr. Bolen stated that some of these issues with congestion, increasing and shortening trips are related to the “what if” scenario and based on the fuel price which will increase over time. Mr. Bolen also stated that there has been a documented trend of these increases in values throughout the west; there is going to be more capacity created and more housing built in areas that are more transportation efficient because of time and cost.

Ms. Shiomoto-Lohr stressed her concern with the final sentence given that it will be presented to a policy committee. She stated that the sentence was more of a declarative statement versus a desired trend that may or may not occur.

**Deleted:** and more of what we desire to happen but may not occur.

Rich Kuzmyak provided members with an update on the 4D process. He stated that the following items have taken place since the last P&P TAC meeting:

- Questions on the regression models from the last P&P TAC meeting were received and were responded to,
- Met with SCAG technical committee on August 21<sup>st</sup> to detail the approach for the application,
- Caliper staff has been working on completing the programming for the application and Fregonese & Associates is working on completing the baseline.

Mr. Kuzmyak explained the approach by which the 4D process was applied at a TAZ level. The assessment of the first stage analysis is that the regional model is not sensitive to the effects of land use on household behavior. Auto ownership should be less in areas where there is good land use. The rates of auto use and average trip length should be less in those areas. An assumption is made that the four-step model will account for the macro-effects of the socioeconomic assumptions and transportation-level effects on interzonal travel. We are making an assumption that those impacts will be more pronounced on work trips. 4Ds effects are most pronounced on interzonal travel, which is primarily non-work related.

Mr. Kuzmyak added that estimates on the 4D effects will be made within a TAZ based on grid cells. Focus will be made on the amount of activity that is in those grid cells and the land use definition that is being assumed for those grid cells. This will tell us what the land use will be.

Mr. Kuzmyak stated that once Fregonese & Associates provides the data, the next steps are to quickly run a test application on Los Angeles County, review, and discuss the outcome with SCAG staff. Additionally, Mr. Kuzmyak stated that he hopes to create this program that can be included in the TRANSCAD system so that SCAG staff can run these investigations since the Caliper Corporation contract will run out at the end of September.

Tony Van Haagen, Caltrans-District 7, asked what the percentage of the interzonal travel is of the total VMT and how significant this is because greater concentration is made on the intrazonal VMT. Mr. Kuzmyak stated that land use within the zone has a very direct effect on the number of vehicles that households living there will own, and the number of trips that they will make by vehicle as opposed to walking and how long those trips will be. On average, we are assuming that good intrazonal characteristics will bring down the average number of trips and the average VMT for that household in direct measure to how good their land use is; I am not able to provide a definite percentage. Mr. Kuzmyak stated that the TRANSCAD software designers are able to provide a more detailed presentation. Mr. Van Haagen welcomed the suggestion and further stated that a good reality check would be to test this out on the Base Year. Mr. Kuzmyak agreed.

Deleted: reflecting

Ms. Shiomoto-Lohr noted that cities typically rely on a land use-based transportation model. If cities run the land use model and look at it from what is in their general plan for specific TAZ's, and also in relation to what is being proposed as part of Envision, we will be looking at the analysis from a specific trip generation perspective and with traditional ITE trip generation rates that are applicable to that jurisdiction. She inquired if you could actually have a worst case scenario where the number of trips based on those different specific uses is more than what is coming from the SCAG's alternative scenarios because of the trip generation component? Then the issue is where in the SCAG RTP EIR have you analyzed the worst case scenario if there is a scenario that could be worse if people do not change their trip behavior from the typical ITE trip generation rates? What would be the impact to the local circulation system within that TAZ as a result of the additional trips?

Deleted: asked if

Deleted: typical

Deleted: models

Deleted: and they

Deleted: if these land use models do not have the factors to adjust, and

Deleted: this

Deleted: , could

Deleted: Baseline

Mr. Kuzmyak stated that one thing we need to expect is that as we move massive blocks of housing, if we have a TAZ that is going to get a lot of land use treatment with density and base around transit, then we'll want to put more jobs and housing in those areas to take advantage of the transportation efficiency. If we increased the activity then you'll see more vehicle trips, but then you need to look at the area. Is the increase and efficiency from those areas enough to counter-balance our relatively high rates of production of VMT outside the blueprint areas from a smaller number of households and jobs that are producing it? Knowing what you are going to deal with, you can begin to look at mitigation remedies that will allow you to look at mode shift or traffic generation.

Deleted: o

Deleted: liza

Ms. Shiimoto-Lohr stated that there will be localized impacts to the circulation impact that are not quantified and integrated in SCAG's cost scenarios; they will be occurring in existing developed areas where there is a great potential that the capacity needs necessary to handle the increase in traffic will be very expensive or not doable. There needs to be a local perspective side that is not in here but will be very real to those jurisdictions who all of a sudden propose to get a lot more housing and employment in traffic analysis zones that for all intents and purposes are developed and traffic mitigation options are limited.

Deleted: the

Deleted: that are identified

Deleted: where

## 5.0 STAFF REPORT

There was no staff report.

## 6.0 ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Schuiling adjourned the meeting at 1:05 pm. The next meeting of the Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee is to be decided.

---

Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
of the  
Southern California Association of Governments

October 15, 2007

***Minutes***

---

**THE FOLLOWING MINUTES ARE A SUMMARY THE PLANS & PROGRAMS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) MEETING. THE AUDIO CASSETTE TAPE OF THE ACTUAL MEETING IS AVAILABLE FOR LISTENING IN SCAG'S OFFICE.**

The P&P TAC held its meeting at the SCAG Headquarters in Los Angeles. The meeting was called to order by Miles Mitchell, Vice-Chair, LADOT.

**Members Present:**

Miles Mitchell, Vice-Chair	LADOT
Lori Abrishami	LACMTA
Joanna Capelle	SCRRA
Deborah Chankin	Gateway Cities COG
Deborah Diep	CDR / CSU Fullerton
Kim Fuentes	South Bay Cities COG
Dana Gabbard	So. Ca. Transit Advocates
Bill Gayk (JiHong McDermott for)	Riverside County Transportation & Land Mgmt. Agency
Paula McHargue	LAWA
Greg Nord	OCTA
Tracy Sato	City of Anaheim
Gail Shiimoto-Lohr	Orange County COG
Jim Stewart	SCCED
Carla Walecka	Transportation Corridor Agencies

**Conference Call:**

Maurice Eaton	Caltrans
Brian Kuhn	City of Palmdale
Rosa Lopez	IVAG
Arnold San Miguel	SCAG

**SCAG Staff:**

Greg Bolen, Consultant	Bob Huddy	Jonathan Nadler
Tarek Hatata, Consultant	Keith Killough	Bev Perry
Joseph Alcock	Ryan Kuo	Alan Thompson
Darin Chidsey	Phillip Law	Frank Wen
André Darmanin	Rich Macias	Akiko Yamagami
Mike Jones	Jessica Meaney	

## **1.0 CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Miles Mitchell, Vice-Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Introductions were made.

## **2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

There was no public comment.

## **3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR**

### **3.1 Approval Items**

#### **3.1.1 Approve Minutes of August 27, 2007**

Members reviewed minutes of the previous meeting and recommended that minutes be updated and approved at the next meeting of the P&P TAC.

## **4.0 DISCUSSION ITEMS**

### **4.1 Standing Items**

#### **4.1.1 Growth Forecast**

Glen Bolen, Fregonese & Associates, briefed members on the most recent developments of the Regional Transportation Plan's (RTP) Compass Blueprint land use strategy. Mr. Bolen reported the following policy directions that were agreed to by SCAG's Community, Economic and Human Development Committee (CEHD):

- Identify strategic areas for infill.
- Structure plan on a 3-tiered system of centers development.
- Develop complete communities.
- Plan comprehensively for development of nodes along transportation corridors.
- Plan for changing demographics; explore additional growth potential and future housing preferences.
- Continue to protect stable existing single family areas.
- Plan for increased housing and employment capacity within areas that are well served by our transportation network.

Mr. Bolen provided illustrative examples of the City of El Centro's current downtown facade as well as conceptual illustrations of the city incorporating a mixed use environment. Mr. Bolen stated that staff has had multiple, in-depth meetings with several cities that have recently updated their general plans in order to better compare the cities' general plans with the kind of land use and transportation connections that are found in the Compass Blueprint. Mr. Bolen stated that as a result of these meetings the cities have demonstrated greater motivation for transit centers than in the past. The cities are planning for greater densities within transit-oriented development (TOD) areas than in previous RTPs.

Urban designs were presented illustrating the City of Ontario's plan to include more pedestrian friendly areas.

Mr. Bolen summarized the steps taken in forming the draft alternatives. The initial process began with fifteen subregional workshops in which SCAG and local jurisdiction staff reviewed area maps, TAZs and development types. Data received from these workshops was then logged and aided in the testing of the RTP scenarios. Mr. Bolen also discussed the idea of focusing the jurisdictions' highest job and housing densities in centers and along key corridors.

Deborah Chankin, Gateway Cities COG, requested clarification on the "baseline" terminology that is being used in Mr. Bolen's presentation. Ms. Chankin further stated that others are using "baseline" to mean the subregional input from the RHNA workshops. Mr. Bolen stated that "baseline" refers to the maps that were reviewed at the workshops and is not the product of the workshops.

Discussion was made regarding the terms used in the scenario history. After much discussion, it was agreed that the terms would be amended as follows: 1. 2004 RTP, 2. Workshop, 3. Baseline which is the revised workshop, 4. Envision, and 5. Proposed 2008 RTP.

Lynn Harris, SCAG, advised the TAC that Item 5 should be termed "Proposed 2008 RTP Preferred Alternative" since this is a federal document. Ms. Harris stated that in the 2004 RTP the Compass Blueprint work was introduced and noted that it would continue through to the 2008 RTP. The principles of the Compass Plan, the Growth Vision, were actually the original work program aimed at the 2008 RTP. Ms. Harris stated that focus should be made on the 2008 RTP in which we are required by law to present alternatives and analyze those alternatives in the EIR.

Miles Mitchell, LADOT, stated that moving forward, there is a need for transparency in order to avoid this type of frustration and to facilitate good cooperation between SCAG staff and the region, subregions, and the communities.

Carla Walecka, Transportation Corridor Agencies, suggested that when discussing the 2004 RTP Updated scenario, it should include "Updated to 2035" and reference should be made to the Compass 2% in order to assist in identifying. Ms. Walecka also suggested that the presentation slides not include the Compass Blueprint footer in order to avoid confusion. An additional request was made to take the above-mentioned terms for consistency and include their definition and a link to the corresponding data set so that it is completely clear on the webpage. Ms. Harris agreed with the requested changes.

#### 4.2 Conformity Update

Jonathan Nadler, SCAG, briefly discussed the conformity requirements. Mr. Nadler stated that federal law requires those transportation activities that receive federal funding or approval to conform to the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) and the State Implementation Plan (SIP). These include emission inventories from all sources and a set of control measures that reduce emissions to within the carrying



capacity to meet attainment for each pollutant. Included in the inventories and control strategy are emission budgets for on-road mobile sources. One test of conformity for the RTP or RTIP is the Regional Emissions Analysis, which needs to show that the on-road emissions associated with the Plan are within the on-road emissions budgets that are assumed in the SIP.

Mr. Nadler also noted that there are emission budgets for each pollutant in each non-attainment or maintenance area in the SCAG region. For example, in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), there are tests for ozone, PM10, NO2, CO, and PM2.5. Another conformity test is the timely implementation of transportation control measures (TCMs), which are projects that help reduce congestion. The committed TCMs are those that have funding the first two years of the TIP; they are included in the AQMP and the SIP and become part of the control strategy. Mr. Nadler stated that one of the tests for conformity is to demonstrate timeliness with the TCMs that are assumed in the SIP. Where the schedule is off, project sponsors must show that they are overcoming any obstacles or in the worst case, they have to substitute a new project or projects to meet the emission reductions assumed. The last timely implementation report was done for the 2006 RTIP.

Mr. Nadler reported that there is no definitive answer as to where we are on the regional emissions analysis for the upcoming RTP. Mr. Nadler stated that in terms of conformity, re-entrained road dust can be problematic relative to meeting conformity since fugitive dust increases with increased VMT.

Gail Shiimoto-Lohr, Orange County COG, asked about the use of local jurisdiction AB2766 fees as a transportation control measure. Mr. Nadler stated that this was in the control strategy and is a discussion point that the ARB had suggested as a means to close the 74-ton gap in NOx emission reductions to meet the 2014 PM2.5 standard in the South Coast Air Basin. Ms. Shiimoto-Lohr stated that it was her understanding that the AB2766 fees were not backstopped, so the amount of reductions that need to be attained by that particular control strategy must be achieved. Mr. Nadler added that the SIP required many far-reaching strategies which affected all sources. He stated that he was not sure when the consultation process would begin with the local jurisdictions relative to this measure but would follow up. Ms. Shiimoto-Lohr explained that this information is critical because many jurisdictions have already allocated those funds towards projects that may not achieve the necessary reductions.

#### 4.3 Summary Results of Modeling Analysis

Tarek Hatata, System Metrics, presented on the system performance measures. Mr. Hatata stated that all of the alternatives being presented were network alternatives that use the same base forecast called “baseline.” Mr. Hatata outlined the six alternatives, which are:

- CTC Plan, which includes county commission feedback and input into the model for 2035
- Alternative 1 Plus I-710 Truck Lanes
- Alternative 1 Plus HSRT Extended IOS (LAX – San Bernardino)



- Alternative 1 plus I-710 Tunnel, Gold Line Extension (Azusa – Montclair), High Desert Corridor, I-710 Truck Lanes, Purple Line Extension to Fairfax
- Alternative 1 plus High-Desert Corridor
- Alternative 1 plus Orange-Riverside CETAP Corridors

Mr. Hatata discussed daily speeds for each of the above-mentioned alternatives. He stated that region-wide, all of the different alternatives improve speed. Percentage-wise, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties improve by a much larger percentage than other counties on a region-wide scale. From a delay perspective, total delay will increase regardless of the alternative.

Mr. Hatata also presented total region-wide speed improvements in all PM Peak speed cases with a more dramatic improvement in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties. Delay also improves in the PM Peak. A few of these improvements relate directly to the I-710 freeway tunnel and High-Desert Corridor in Alternative 4. Alternative 5 improvements may relate to the High-Desert Corridor. Many of the improvements in Riverside and San Bernardino deal with CETAP corridors and/or the many state highway expenditures in both counties. Mr. Hatata reported that overall, the expenditures of Los Angeles and Ventura County are significantly higher in transit than in roadway; in San Bernardino, Riverside, and Orange County, expenditures are higher in roadway than in transit.

Mr. Hatata also presented Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) results. He added that there are no transportation demand management strategies in the 2004 RTP and there are no land use strategies that are likely to be adopted. Without these strategies, the improvements add VMT and total VMT increases between six and ten million miles per day.

The next steps are to bundle alternatives to preferred policy alternatives (based on additional revenues and projects), incorporate the preferred land use alternative, evaluate air quality conformity, and develop the final draft plan.

#### 4.4 Overview of RTP Workshops

Rich Macias, SCAG Manager of Transportation Planning and Policy, briefed members on the progress of the RTP workshops. To date, four workshops have taken place regarding Transportation Finance, Goods Movement, and Corridors. Mr. Macias stated that a matrix had been developed for the subject matter to be discussed at each workshop. For example, with goods movement, all goods movement projects were identified, along with costs, commitments, pros and cons, options, and staff recommendations.

Mr. Macias stated that the committees have provided positive feedback and the Goods Movement workshop worked very well with the assistance of the matrix. The problem is that a definitive plan will not be ready until the conclusion of the workshops. There are two remaining workshops; the next is scheduled on October 18<sup>th</sup> at Ontario Convention Center and the subject matter is Aviation, High-Speed Regional Transport, Transit, and Land Use. The final workshop is a Wrap-up

workshop scheduled for October 25<sup>th</sup> at OCTA offices in Orange, CA. Mr. Macias stated that TAC members will review the Draft RTP once it is released.

Mr. Macias provided an overview of the conformity process. The conformity for the SCAG region ends on June 7, 2008. The federal agencies are given two months to review the RTP. Moving backwards, the Plan is typically adopted sometime in April 2008. Therefore the 90-day period would end sometime in February.

Mr. Mitchell thanked SCAG staff for their hard work on the creation of the matrices and overall workshop management.

## **5.0 STAFF REPORT**

There was no staff report.

## **6.0 ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Mitchell adjourned the meeting at 12:35 pm. The next meeting of the Plans & Programs Technical Advisory Committee is to be determined.